REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9 and 12-14 have been amended, and new claims 17-22 have been added. Claims 1-22 are now pending in this application, with claims 1, 12, 17 and 20 being the only independent claims.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9 and 12-14 have been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9 and 12-14 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights

under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 (Matthews III). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matthews, III in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,635,989 (Rothmuller). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matthews III in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,509 (Portuesi). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matthews III in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,367,080 (Enomoto). Further, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matthews, III in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402 (Collings).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-22 should be allowable over Matthews III, Rothmuller, Portuesi, Enomoto and Collings for at least the following reasons.

Matthews III is directed to an electronic program guide (EPG) with hyperlinks to target resources. When a viewer activates a hyperlink within the EPG, a user interface unit launches a browser to activate the target resource specified in the hyperlink, such as hyperlinks 58 shown in FIG 2.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 12, amongst other patentable elements requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

> wherein search criteria for the internet searches is formulated based on data included in an electronic program guide.

In Matthews III, links are merely for access. Matthews III is completely silent and is not concerned with any search criteria, let alone search criteria formulated based on data included in the EPG.

Further, the present invention as recited in independent claim 17, and similarly recited in independent claim 20, amongst other patentable elements requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

> allowing access to said advance information at designated times relative to broadcast of said scheduled material or in response to a signal from a broadcaster of said scheduled material.

On page 8 of the Office Action, Collings is cited to allegedly show the time-locked feature recited in claim 10. Collings is directed to a method and apparatus for selectively blocking television programming that meets criteria specified by a user, not

a broadcaster, such as for parental control.

It is respectfully submitted that Matthews III, Collings, and combination thereof, do not teach or suggest allowing access to **advance information**, let alone allowing access to the advance information relative to broadcast of the of the scheduled material. For example, this allows blocking access to a portion of the advance information while the broadcast is being viewed.

Rothmuller, Portuesi and Enomoto are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Matthews III and Collings.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 12, 17 and 20 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-11, 13-16, 18-19 and 21-22 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1, 12, 17 and 20.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the

presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due beyond the fee for additional claims to be charged to the credit card as noted by the enclosed authorization. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required for entrance of the accompanying amendment, they may be charged to Applicants' representatives Deposit Account No. 50-3649. In addition, please credit any overpayments related to any fees paid in connection with the accompanying amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-3649.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
April 24, 2006

Enclosure: New Abstract
Authorization to charge credit card $300 for one independent claims in excess of three (four total), and two claims in excess of twenty

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101